Dear Dave, 2/26/91

When we spoke Sunday I mentioned that I'd written the attached analysis of Saddam's speech of last Thursday in part because it might be of use in helping younger people to think independently of official and media statements and analyses and commentaries.

Last night I heard the broadcast of Baghdad's radio broadcast that the Iraqi troops are being withdrawn from Kuwait and along with it Saddam's declaration that he had won. What I'd said, he declared vistory to those of the Arab masses who would believe him. Before working at my desk until leaving for my walking I heard nothing new on this, nor did I after my return, other than that soon Bush will make a speech.

If we did not have a bunch of people running the government who are long on ideology and short on common sense, they'd have used that soeech and that I think open bid for terms to do what they should have seen was possible if only half of our military claims were true. To begin with it was absolutely necessary, regardless of what his pals in the Arab world say, to publicly himiliate Saddam before he had a chance to acknwoledge what was already the fact, that he'd been beaten. This was necessaary to destroy his influence and to convert the whole thing into a lesson for those who would be tempted to emulate him.

We should have said we interpreted his speech as a bid for terms to get out before he was driven out but that he had started the war and he wanted to end it on his terms, which is unacceptable. He can settle it on our terms only and if he doesn't the needless destruction of his country and his troops and all the added suffering for Iraq would have to continue. Informally we did say he had to abide by the UN's resolutions but that should have been made formal and conditions, the addition of which were the subject of his complaint and the basis for his bid to end it with his face saved, should have been added. It he decides formally and publicly to abide by all the UN's resolutions he can withdraw his men without any attack on them but only if they retreat as a defeated army, leaving their weapons in place. We should the had added conditions that are not inconsistent with his having started the war, that he had to destroy all his means of mass destruction, whether or not he has any nuclear, including all SCUDS etc bacteriological and chemical. I think renouncing all claim to Kuwait is in a UN resolution but if not it should be added. Plus reparations over a period of years that can be paid, if no other way, by Iraq's income from oil.

If this then had all been stated as minimum conditions for his gettting his troops back without any attacks on them he would be humiliated, he would not now be playing more tricks with more appeals to the countries that support him and the Arab masses and it would have been reduced to a yes or no situation: he would be abject and humiliated or it would be the same in the long run if he didn't only he'd lose that many more of his troops. And Iraq would continued to be battered by air.

If he had not accepted this, and we can still inist on those terms, the prospects of his own people, particularly the military, taking care of him would have increased.

I'd read about half the previous page when Bush started to speak. In some respects it was a good speech and if he was not as explicit on some demands as he could and should have been maybe they are included.

But he made a typical Bush-league blunder!

He concluded by praising out troops only!

Not a word about any others. Especially was this incredible because he made no mention of any Arab troops.

Hastily,

Harold